



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/656,533	09/07/2000	Guido Maffezoni	ADAPP142	2330

25920 7590 05/05/2004

MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE
SUITE 170
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

MAURO JR, THOMAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/656,533

Applicant(s)

MAFFEZONI, GUIDO

Examiner

Thomas J. Mauro Jr.

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 September 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment (Paper # 5) filed on March 5, 2004. Claims 1-25 remain pending.
2. Claims 1-25 are presented for further examination.
3. Objection to drawings and 112 2nd paragraph of non-final rejection has been withdrawn.

Drawings

4. New corrected drawings are required in this application because hand drawings are not acceptable for reproducible quality. Under 37 CFR 1.84(l), drawings must be made by a process which will give them satisfactory reproduction characteristics. Every line, number, and letter must be durable, clean, black (except for color drawings), sufficiently dense and dark, and uniformly thick and well defined. Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsman outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459).

With respect to claim 1, Orr teaches a method for enabling access to resources connected to client nodes of a network, the method comprising:

- establishing communication between a local client and a remote client [**Orr -- Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 9-22 and lines 40-46 – Client computer(s) (12), i.e. local client, establishes session with server(s) (16), i.e. remote client**], the local client being

configured to provide a remote client identification code and a password to the remote client [Orr -- Figure 3, Col. 1 lines 63-65, Col. 3 lines 40-46, Col. 4 lines 64-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-21 and lines 60-65 – User logs on to the client system, inherently requiring a username and password, which initiates session with remote client, i.e. server, further invoking VP agent process on server to provide log-on information to VP broker on server to initiate virtual desktop] using a DCOM enabled link [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44], the establishing being completed by confirmation from the remote client that the remote client identification code and the password match [Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-46, Col. 5 lines 66-67 – Col. 6 lines 1-6 – Confirmation occurs if broker provides confirmed inter-process communication (IPC) resources and virtual desktop is started and provided to the client];

- determining if adapters are connected to the remote client [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... local client has access to];
- establishing connection to a selected adapter [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required for local client to run programs and access files on remote client, i.e. server]; and
- connecting the local client to the selected adapter [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required for local client to execute commands on remote client, i.e. server], the selected adapter being configured to appear on a first graphical user interface (GUI) of the local client as if the selected adapter of the remote client were physically connected to the local client [Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop,

i.e. GUI, shows all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client, i.e. server, as if they were located on the local client, i.e. client computer].

With respect to claim 6, Orr-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed including having the local client provide the remote client identification and the password using a third graphical user interface (GUI) [Orr -- Figures 3 and 4 and Col. 5 lines 59-62 – In order for client to logon to server, server must issue and send to client the logon credentials, i.e. username and password].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459) as applied to claim 1, in view of Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Regarding claim 2, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, including the local client providing a computer identification to the remote client prior to establishing communication between the local client and the remote client, the computer information

Art Unit: 2143

containing the remote client identification code and connection password [**Orr -- Col. 5 lines 60-62 – Local client is required to provide log on information to remote client before the remote client can log on to the system**]. Orr fails to teach an access password.

Guheen, however, teaches having multiple user id(s) and passwords to access subsystems within a server [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Access passwords, aside from standard login, allows access to specific resources**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing restricted access to certain resources and information rather than using a single password/sign-on which would allow access to the entire system [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-67**].

Regarding claim 3, Orr-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed including the aforementioned limitations in claim 2, including choosing the selected adapter using a second graphical user interface (GUI) [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Access to adapters are inherently required for agent, acting for local client to run programs and access files on remote client, i.e. server**]; and providing the access password using the second GUI [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Access passwords, aside from standard login, allows access to specific resources, i.e. adapters**].

Art Unit: 2143

5. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459).

Claims 4-5 describe enabling access to resources connected to client nodes on a network wherein the remote client functions as a server for the local client (claim 4) and wherein the local client functions as a server for the remote client (claim 5).

Orr-Guheen discloses the remote client, i.e. server, provides access for the local client, i.e. client computer [**Orr -- Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 8-10 – Remote requester or client, i.e. local client, accesses server, i.e. remote client**]. As is known in the art, any device or computer at any point in the time can access another computer, i.e. server, to access resources. At the same time, that device or computer can act as a server for another computer wanting some resource. As was upheld in *In re Gazda* (219 F.2d 449, 104 USPQ 400 (CCPA 1955)), reversal of parts, in this case switching a client to be a server and a server to be a client, is an obvious modification to a system.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 7, Orr teaches the invention as aforementioned in claim 1 above, but fail to teach a local client user clicking on an icon to access the adapter.

Application/Control Number: 09/656,533

Art Unit: 2143

Kempf, however, teaches accessing an adapter object by clicking on a GUI object [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the accessing of remote adapters by clicking on an icon, as taught by Kempf into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a well known and easy method to provide a direct link between a distributed device adapter and a graphical user interface GUI.

Regarding claim 8, Orr-Kempf teaches the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the selected adapter connected to the remote client does not differentiate between the local client and the remote client when the local client is accessing the selected adapter [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 31-53 – Client accesses resources using a virtual desktop, upon which full control is given as if applications and files were local**].

7. Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880).

Regarding claim 9, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 1, but fails to teach the sending inquiry commands to the remote client to determine if adapters are connected.

McNeill, however, teaches this limitation substantially as claimed, sending inquiry commands to

Art Unit: 2143

the remote client [McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – **SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the sending of SCSI inquiry commands, as taught by McNeill into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server and provide access to SCSI devices on non-local buses [McNeill -- Col. 3 lines 10-15].

Regarding claim 10, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the inquiry commands are SCSI commands [McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 15-16 – **SCSI inquiry commands**].

Regarding claim 11, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the SCSI commands are encapsulated in packets suitable for DCOM transmission [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44 – **If the request is from a remote user, packets are sent out using DCOM. Therefore, SCSI inquiry commands are encapsulated and sent out over the communications link using DCOM**].

8. Claims 12, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459) in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880).

Regarding claim 12, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, the method comprising:

configuring a local client and a remote client for remote connectivity [**Orr -- Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 9-22 and lines 40-46 – Client computer(s) (12), i.e. local client, establishes session with server(s) (16), i.e. remote client, to communicate requests]** using a distributed component object model (DCOM) enabled link [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44 – DCOM**], where the local client provides a remote client identification and a connection password to the remote client during the configuration operation [**Orr -- Figure 3, Col. 1 lines 63-65, Col. 3 lines 40-46, Col. 4 lines 64-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-21 and lines 60-65 – User logs on to the client system, inherently requiring a username and password, which initiates session with remote client, i.e. server, further invoking VP agent process on server to provide log-on information to VP broker on server to initiate virtual desktop**];

determining if host adapters are connected to the remote client [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... local client has access to**];

selecting a host adapter connected to the remote client [**Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – Access to adapters are inherently required for local client to run programs and access files on remote client, i.e. server**]; and

Art Unit: 2143

communicating with the selected host adapter, where the local client accesses and uses the selected host adapter as if the selected host adapter belonged to the local client [**Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client, i.e. server, as if they were located on the local client, i.e. client computer**].

Orr fails to teach accessing small computer system interface (SCSI) devices and using SCSI devices in the system.

McNeill, however, teaches accessing non-local SCSI devices, which includes sending out SCSI inquiry commands to detect SCSI adapters and connecting to them [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the connectivity to non-local SCSI devices, as taught by McNeill into the invention to Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server and provide access to SCSI devices on non-local buses [**McNeill -- Col. 3 lines 10-15**].

Regarding claim 15, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the SCSI host adapters connected to the remote client are configured to appear on a graphical user interface (GUI) of the local client as if the SCSI host adapters belong to the local client [**Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client, i.e. server, as if they were located on the local client, i.e. client computer**].

Regarding claim 19, this claim contains limitations similar to the limitations in claim 6. Therefore, claim 19 is rejected under the same rationale.

9. Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S 6,463,459), as applied to claim 12 above.

Regarding claims 13-14, these are similar in nature to claims 4 and 5, as they set forth the same limitations. Therefore, claims 13-14 are rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill as applied to claim 15, in view of Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 16-17, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claims 12 and 15 above, but fail to teach having a SCSI host adapter icon in which the user can select the adapter by clicking on the icon. Kempf, however, teaches wherein the SCSI host adapters are configured as SCSI host adapter icons on the GUI of the local client (claim 16) and wherein a user selects the selected SCSI host adapter by clicking on a SCSI host adapter icon on the GUI of the local client (claim 17) [Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 -- Host adapter icon appear on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access].

Art Unit: 2143

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of SCSI host adapter icons on the GUI of the local client which provide access to the adapter through clicking on them, as taught by Kempf into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a direct connection between a distributed device and a graphical user interface object.

11. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr-McNeill, as applied to claim 12 above, in view of Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Regarding claim 18, Orr-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 12, but fail to teach the use of an access password to access the SCSI host adapter.

Guheen, however, teaches the use of an access password to access specific resources of a system, separate from a general sign-on, i.e. username and password [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing access to information rather than using a single password/sign-on.

Regarding claim 20, Orr-McNeill-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client selects the selected SCSI host adapter [**McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 65 – SCSI host adapter**] and inputs the access password using a graphical user interface (GUI) [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password, which is presented to the user's GUI before access is allowed**].

12. Claims 21, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459), in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880) and Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308).

Regarding claim 21, Orr teaches the invention substantially as claimed, a method for accessing resources connected to remotely located client nodes on a network, the resources being displayed on a first graphical user interface (GUI) of a local client, the method comprising:

configuring the local client and a remote client for remote connectivity [**Orr -- Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 9-22 and lines 40-46 – Client computer(s) (12), i.e. local client, establishes session with server(s) (16), i.e. remote client, to communicate requests**], the local client having a remote client identification and a connection password which allows access to the remote client [**Orr -- Figure 3, Col. 1 lines 63-65, Col. 3 lines 40-46, Col. 4 lines 64-67 – Col. 5 lines 1-21 and lines 60-65 – User logs on to the client system, inherently requiring a**

Art Unit: 2143

username and password, which initiates session with remote client, i.e. server, further invoking VP agent process on server to provide log-on information to VP broker on server to initiate virtual desktop] using a distributed component object model (DCOM) enabled link [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44];

determining if host adapters are connected to the remote client [Orr -- Col. 6 lines 45-53 – **Inherently required once virtual desktop is set-up to determine which adapters, i.e. hard drive, CD-Rom, etc... local client has access to]; and**

communicating with the host adapter, the host adapter appearing on the GUI of the local client as if the adapter belonged to the local client [Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-44 – **Virtual desktop, i.e. GUI, shows all applications and peripherals connected to the remote client, i.e. server, as if they were located on the local client, i.e. client computer].**

Orr fails to teach accessing small computer system interface (SCSI) devices and using SCSI devices in the system and providing a clickable icon on the GUI of the client which provides direct access to the SCSI adapter.

McNeill, however, teaches accessing non-local SCSI devices, which includes sending out SCSI inquiry commands to detect SCSI adapters and connecting to them [McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – **SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available].**

Furthermore, Kempf teaches wherein the SCSI host adapters are configured as icons on the GUI of the local client and wherein a user selects the selected adapter by clicking on the icon on the GUI of the local client [Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 – **Host adapter icon appear on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access].**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

Art Unit: 2143

to incorporate the connectivity to non-local SCSI devices through the use of clickable icon(s) on the GUI of the client, as taught by McNeill and Kempf into the invention to Orr, in order to provide a means to determine the availability of a specific type of adapter, i.e. SCSI adapter, on the remote client/server providing access to SCSI devices on non-local buses **[McNeill -- Col. 3 lines 10-15]** and to connect to these non-local devices, in addition to providing a direct connection between a distributed device and a graphical user interface object..

Regarding claim 23, Orr-McNeill-Kempf teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client inputs the remote client identification and the connection password using a second GUI which allows for remote SCSI connection **[Orr -- Col. 3 lines 40-46 and Col. 5 lines 60-62 – Local client is required to log on information to remote client before the remote client, i.e. server, can provide services]**.

Regarding claim 25, Orr-McNeill-Kempf teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the local client communicates with the remote client using SCSI commands **[McNeill -- Col. 3 lines 18-20 – Communication with SCSI devices require using SCSI commands]**.

13. Claims 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orr et al. (U.S. 6,463,459), in view of McNeill, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,721,880) and Kempf et al. (U.S. 6,374,308) and Guheen et al. (U.S. 6,615,166).

Art Unit: 2143

Regarding claim 22, Orr-Kempf-McNeill teach the invention substantially as claimed, as aforementioned in claim 21 above, but fails to teach providing an access password to access the SCSI host adapter.

Guheen, however, teaches the use of an access password to access specific resources of a system, separate from a general sign-on, i.e. username and password [**Guheen -- Col. 148 lines 59-65 – Accessing specific resources requires the entering of a second password, i.e. access password**].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of access passwords for accessing specific resources, as taught by Guheen into the invention of Orr, in order to provide a more secure means for authenticating and providing access to information rather than using a single password/sign-on.

Regarding claim 24, Orr-McNeill-Kempf-Guheen teach the invention substantially as claimed, wherein the access password is input using a third GUI which allows for host adapter selection [**Kempf -- Col. 6 lines 43-46 – Adapter icon appears on the GUI, allowing user to select adapter and click on icon for access, upon which access password is required to access resource**].

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed March 5, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

(A) Applicant contends that Orr does not teach a local client computer and a remote client computer, whereas claim 1 calls for this limitation.

In response to argument A, Examiner draws the applicant to the above-clarified rejection for claims 1, 12 and 21. In it, as can be seen in Orr, Figure 1 and Col. 3 lines 9-23 and lines 40-46, Orr clearly shows the distinction between two separate computers, a client computer, i.e. local client, and a server computer, i.e. remote client. Thus, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion because Orr clearly defines and shows a local client computer and a remote client computer, i.e. server.

(B) Applicant contends that the adapters described in Kempf are different than the adapters of the instant application.

In response to argument B, Examiner asserts that the Kempf reference is used merely to show the use of an icon that provides direct access to a component. See Kempf Col. 6 lines 43-46 and the above rejection which further exemplifies the fact that Kempf provides the icon which

Art Unit: 2143

allows the user to access an adapter object from the desktop. Thus, Applicant has mischaracterized the features that the Examiner uses the Kempf reference to provide.

(C) Applicant argues that Guheen uses user identification and passwords to access information in a web server, whereas applicant contends instant invention provides access to peripheral devices.

In response to argument C, Examiner asserts that Guheen does in fact teach access to peripheral devices. By definition, a peripheral is any device attached to the computer which the microprocessor controls (Microsoft Computer Dictionary, 5th Edition), i.e. a hard drive. Therefore, because Guheen has access to information stored in the web server, he is thereby accessing an adapter, for example, the hard drive adapter, in order to gain access to information or files stored on the server. During patent examination and prosecution, claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 1184, 26 USPQ2d 1057, 1059 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541, 550 (CCPA 1969). Giving the instant claims their broadest reasonable interpretation, “connecting and communicating with an adapter” is broad enough to read on the information accessed from the web server, i.e. hard drive of Guheen. Furthermore, Examiner asserts that Guheen is merely used to show that different passwords are used to access different components, as is detailed in the above rejection. Thus, the Examiner accordingly demurs to this assertion.

(D) Applicant argues that McNeill communicates with SCSI devices using a SCSI bus, whereas the instant application calls for using a DCOM link.

In response to argument D, Examiner asserts that it is the combination of McNeill and Orr that discloses the communication using a DCOM link with a remote requestor which allows for access to SCSI devices. McNeill, as is shown in the rejection above, is used to provide the sending of inquiry commands to a remote client, specifically SCSI commands, in order to determine the adapters present **[McNeill -- Col. 5 lines 12-18 – SCSI Inquiry commands are sent to determine which devices are available]**. Orr **[Orr -- Col. 6 lines 40-44]** discloses using a DCOM link in order to communicate with a remote requestor, which is exactly what the applicant's instant invention claims. The motivation to combine these two references would have been obvious because a DCOM link was well known in the art at the time the invention was made as an easy and discrete way to distribute components between two computers running an application over a network.

(E) Applicant argues that the motivation to combine Orr, Guheen, Kempf and McNeill is lacking.

In response to argument E, Examiner refers applicant to the above rejection which further clarifies the motivations and the supporting references for the given motivation. Examiner

Art Unit: 2143

asserts that the combination of Orr, Guheen, Kempf and McNeill would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention.

Conclusion

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Mauro Jr. whose telephone number is 703-605-1234. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00a.m. - 4:30p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.


Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



TJM

April 30, 2004



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100